arXiv:1602.05483v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 17 Feb 2016

Non-power-law relaxation in A-B annihilation with exclusion

Rahul Dandekar[1, *]

[1] *ICTP, Trieste, Italy*

(Dated: February 18, 2016)

We explore the effect of initial conditions on the decay of the reaction $A+B \to \phi$ in one dimension, with exclusion interaction between particles. It is well-known that the late-time density of surviving particles goes as $t^{-1/4}$ with random initial conditions, and as $t^{-1/2}$ with alternating initial conditions (ABABAB...). However, recent simulations (Lee, 2014 [12]) a nontrivial exponent for periodic i.c.s with longer periods. By means of extensive first-passage Monte Carlo simulations, and a mapping to a q-state coarsening model which can be solved in the Independent Interval Approximation (IIA), we show that the late-time decay of the density of surviving particles goes as $t^{-1/2}(\log(t))^{-1}$ starting from initial conditions made of even-length blocks (AABBAABB...), but as $t^{-1/2}$ for odd-length blocks (AAABBBAAABBB...). We relate this to what has been called kinetic symmetry breaking in case of the Glauber Ising model. We also explain the slowly varying decay exponents, seen in previous studies, for i.c.s which made of random mixtures of odd- and even-length blocks.

PACS numbers: 64.60.De, 89.75.-k

Introduction: The two-species annihilation reaction $A+B \to \phi$ is one of the simplest examples of a reaction-diffusion system. It has been studied for over thirty years, after first being introduced by Zeldovich and Ovchinnikov in the context of bimolecular chemical reactions [1], and by Toussaint and Wilczek [2] in the context of particle-antiparticle annihilation in the early universe. Apart from other applications such as to hole-particle annihilation in irradiated semiconductors, the reaction has also been important in clarifying the breakdown of mean-field kinetics for finite dimensions [3–5]. In particular, it was realised that in dimensions less than 4, the long-time decay starting from an initially well-mixed configuration does not conform to the mean-field kinetics.

Consider the process $A + B \to \phi$, starting from initial conditions created by an independent Bernoulli point process on each site of d-dimensional lattice: each site holds either an A-type particle, a B-type particle, or is empty, with probabilities c_A, c_B, and $(1 - c_A - c_B)$ respectively. We concentrate on the case where the $c_A = c_B$. Bramson and Lebowitz proved that for large times t, for $d < 4$, the density of surviving particles decays as $t^{-d/4}$. This result differs from the mean-field result which predicts a decay proportional to t^{-1}. The mean-field result fails because it assumes well-mixed concentrations of both reactants, whereas the true picture, as elaborated on later by Leyvraz and Redner [6], is that of a diffusion-controlled late-time separation of the system into domains of A-rich and B-rich regions. Due to the random nature of the initial condition, a large region has an excess of one type of particle over the other, of magnitude about $L^{1/2}$, while the average length of the domains increases diffusively as $L \sim t^{1/2}$, thus giving a decaying density of $t^{-1/4}$.

The above domain picture fails for initial conditions where the excess of one particle type over the other in a large region is $O(1)$, for example, period i.c.s like AABBAABBAABB... . However, we can use another picture of the late-time process in this case. At late times, if it is reasonable to expect that A and B particles mix well enough such that they encounter each other equally often, we can remove the distinction between A and B type particles, accompanied by a halving of the reaction rate. The long time decay with equal starting densities would be then be given by the kinetics of the single-species annihilation reaction [7], and hence goes as $t^{-d/2}$ for $d < 2$. However, even this picture fails in case of particles with exclusion interaction in 1D.

The drastic effects of exclusion interaction between particles in low dimensions have been studied for over 30 years, and a variety of exact results are available for simple models such as the symmetric and asymmetric versions of the simple exclusion process [8]. An example of such a dramatic effect is the subdiffusive behaviour of a tagged particle in the simple exclusion process in 1D [9][10][11].

In presence of exclusion, one can no longer remove the distinction between A- and B-type particles as above. Deviations from the expected behaviour in this case were first seen in simulations by Lee [12] on the Conserved Lattice Gas (CLG) model [13–16], a simple model of active-absorbing phase transitions, which can be exactly mapped in 1D to the A-B annihilation process with stationary B particles and mutual exclusion between the A particles [16, 17]. The relaxation exponents at the critical density are directly related to the relaxation in the A-B annihilation process starting with equal densities. Lee [12] started from periodic initial conditions of the form (in AB notation) $A^nB^nA^nB^n...$, where $[A^n]$ denotes a contiguous block of n A-type particles. The simulations seem to indicate that the number of

* rdandeka@ictp.it

surviving particles decays as $t^{-0.53}$ when the block size n is even and as the expected $t^{-0.5}$ when the block size is odd. We show that within the Independent Interval Approximation (IIA) framework, the decay for n even goes as $t^{-1/2}(\log(t))^{-1}$. Odor and Menyhard [18] studied similar systems, with initial conditions which were random mixtures of different block sizes, and observed an exponent which seemed to depend on the proportions of different blocks in the mixture. Out simulations suggest this might be due to a crossover between the two kinds of decay.

We trace the origin of the logarithmic speed-up of decay to the kind of kinetic symmetry breaking studied in the Glauber Ising model by Majumdar, Dean and Grassberger [19]. We briefly review this study in the next section, with a view to setting up a similar treatment of the AB system in the rest of the paper.

Kinetic Symmetry Breaking in the Glauber model: Consider the 1D Ising model, and denote by $W(S_{i-1}, S_i, S_{i+1})$ the rate of flip of the i^{th} spin, $S_i \to -S_i$ when the neighbouring spins are S_{i-1} and S_{i+1}. Majumdar, Dean and Grassberger studied the case with the following modified zero-temperature Glauber rates:

$$W(+,+,+) = W(-,-,-) = 0 \quad (1)$$
$$W(+,+,-) = W(+,-,-) = 1/2 \quad (2)$$
$$W(-,-,+) = W(-,+,+) = 1/2 \quad (3)$$
$$W(+,-,+) = \alpha \quad (4)$$
$$W(-,+,-) = 1 \quad (5)$$

For $\alpha = 1$ one recovers up-down symmetry in the rates and the original Glauber model (at zero temperature). For $\alpha < 1$ the symmetry between up and down is broken. Denote the magnetisation per unit length by m and the total magnetisation of the system by M. For all α, the only two stable states are those with $m = \pm 1$. We now argue that for all $\alpha < 1$, $m(t) \to -1$ as $t \to \infty$ for almost all initial conditions, in the thermodynamic limit.

With the un-modified Glauber dynamics, the total magnetisation M performs a random walk on an axis from $M = -L$ to $M = +L$, ending at either value with equal probability. With 'kinetic symmetry breaking' as above, the rightward moves corresponding to annihilation of '$-$' (towards $M = +L$) occur with a rate α, thus giving rise to a net leftward bias proportional to $r_1 L$ where r_1 is the density of '$-$' domains of unit length. Thus the system performs a biased random walk, that ends up at $M = -L$ with probability $1 - O(e^{-c(1-\alpha)L})$ for almost all initial conditions (all but those with $M = L - O(1)$.

In this paper, we allow for the fact that each '$-$' domain might have its individual, fixed, value of α (this value can be reassigned in some way when two domains merge). This allows the following derivation to be valid even when all '$-$' domains do not have the same tendency to survive attempts at being annihilated. We denote by $\overline{\alpha}$ the value of α averaged over all the '$-$' domains in the system. Due to domains merging, $\overline{\alpha}$ can change with time

We now briefly outline the derivation in [19]. Denote the number density of domain walls by $N(t)$, and let $L_+(t)$ and $L_-(t)$ denote the number density of $+$ and $-$ domains respectively. Also, the number density of '$+$' domains of length n will be denoted by P_n, and the corresponding for '$-$' domains by R_n. The dynamics obeys the exact equations $\frac{dN}{dt} = -P_1 - \overline{\alpha} R_1$ and $\frac{dL_+}{dt} = -(1-\overline{\alpha})R_1$.

The Independent Interval Approximation (IIA) involves replacing joint probabilities such as the probability to find a domain of length length i next to a domain of length j, $P_{i,j}$, by the product of the probabilities of finding the two types of domains independently, $P_i P_j$ [20]. The evolution equations for P_n and R_n, in the IIA framework, are simpler to write in terms of the quantities $p_n = P_n/N$ and $r_n = R_n/N$, for $n \geq 2$ [19],

$$\frac{dp_n}{dt} = p_{n+1} + p_{n-1} - 2p_n - (1-2\overline{\alpha}) r_1 p_n \quad (6)$$
$$- r_1 p_{n-1} + (1-\overline{\alpha}) p_1 p_n + \overline{\alpha} r_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-2} p_i p_{n-i-1} \right)$$
$$\frac{dr_n}{dt} = r_{n+1} + r_{n-1} - 2r_n - p_1 r_{n+1} - \overline{\alpha} p_1 r_n \quad (7)$$
$$+ p_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-2} r_i r_{n-i-1} \right)$$

where the last term in each equation describes the merging of domains by the annihilation of the opposite kind of domain of length 1.

Knowing that for large times the system will have a magnetisation close to -1, we can simplify these equations. Consider the system at a late-time stage, when it is made of long $-$ domains punctuated by small '$+$' domains. These '$+$' domains rarely merge, and the evolution of p_n is dominated by diffusion of the domain walls. On the other hand, the dominant mechanism for the change in their length distribution of the '$-$'-domains turns out to be the merging (ie, annihilation of the intervening '$+$'-domains), which changes r_n faster than the diffusion terms. Hence, at late times, keeping only the dominant terms, we have, for $n \geq 1$

$$\frac{dp_n}{dt} \approx p_{n+1} + p_{n-1} - 2p_n \quad (8)$$
$$\frac{dr_n}{dt} \approx p_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-2} r_i r_{n-i-1} - r_{n+1} \right) \quad (9)$$

The first equation gives $\sum n p_n \approx c_1 \sqrt{t} = L_+(t)/N(t) \equiv l_+$. The second equation is solved by the ansatz $r_n =$

$\lambda(t)\exp(-n\lambda(t))$ where $\lambda(t)$ obeys the equation

$$\frac{1}{\lambda}\frac{d\lambda}{dt} = \frac{1}{N}\frac{dN}{dt} \tag{10}$$

which implies that $\lambda(t) = c_2 N(t)$. c_1, c_2 are constants set by the state of the system at a time t_0 when the IIA description starts to hold [19]. These solutions for r_n and p_n can be inserted back into eqns. (7) and (8) to self-consistently show the validity of eqns. (8) and (9) at large times.

Solving for $N(t)$ and $m(t)$ using $L_+(t) \approx c_1 N(t)\sqrt{t}$ and $r_1 \approx c_2 N(t)$, we finally get,

$$N(t) = \frac{c}{\sqrt{t}\log(bt)} \text{ and} \tag{11}$$

$$m(t) = -1 + \frac{a}{\log(bt)} \tag{12}$$

where $b = t_0^{-1}$, and a, c are constants which depend on the state of the system, particularly the values of $m(t_0)$ and $r_1(t_0)$ at a time t_0 sufficiently large (8) and (9) hold.

The above holds even with the following two modifications, important in the next few sections: (a) if $\overline{\alpha}$ is not constant in time, as long as it approaches a non-zero constant value for large times, (b) if the + domains also have $\alpha_+ < 0$, as long as $\alpha_+ > \alpha_-$.

Block initial conditions with blocks of lengths 1, 2 and 3: We now define the transition rates in the reaction we will study in the rest of this paper, the 1D A-B annihilation process with same-species exclusion. A site can either be occupied by a single A particle, a single B particle, or can be empty (denoted by ϕ).

$$AB \xrightarrow{1} \phi\phi \tag{13}$$

$$A\phi \overset{1/2}{\rightleftharpoons} \phi A \tag{14}$$

$$B\phi \overset{1/2}{\rightleftharpoons} \phi B \tag{15}$$

The dynamics follows continuous-time updates, and time is measured in the number of Monte-Carlo sweeps of the system. In this and the next section, we will study the decay of the number of surviving particles, starting from periodic initial conditions of the form $\mathrm{A}^n\mathrm{B}^n\mathrm{A}^n\mathrm{B}^n$..., where we call n the block-length. In this section, we consider $n = 1, 2$ and 3.

The decay of the CLG starting from an initial condition which corresponds to the i.c. ABABAB... ($n = 1$), was first studied by Bandyopadhyay [21]. In this case, Kwon and Kim [17] pointed out that a simple mapping to the Glauber Ising model at zero-temperature exists, by identifying the domain walls with particle types: $+|- \to A$ and $-|+ \to B$. Then the block-length 1 initial condition stated above maps to the starting configuration

$$\overset{A}{+}|\overset{B}{-}|\overset{A}{+}|\overset{B}{-}|\overset{A}{+}|\overset{B}{-}|\overset{A}{+}|\overset{B}{-}|+... \tag{16}$$

and the rules (13 - 15) map to the zero-temperature Glauber Ising evolution rules (without kinetic symmetry breaking, that is, $\alpha = 1$). The evolution of the density of domain walls in the system is then known to be

$$N(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi t}} + O(\frac{1}{t}) \tag{17}$$

Now consider the i.c. with $n = 2$, AABBAABB... . We make a mapping of this system to a system where each dual-lattice site can take three values of 'spin', $q = 1, 2, 3$. Identify

$$1|2 \to A,\ 2|3 \to A, \text{ and} \tag{18}$$

$$2|1 \to B,\ 3|2 \to B \tag{19}$$

With this, the $n = 2$ i.c. becomes

$$\overset{A}{1}|\overset{A}{2}|\overset{B}{3}|\overset{B}{2}|\overset{A}{1}|\overset{A}{2}|\overset{B}{3}|\overset{B}{2}|1... \tag{20}$$

where a vertical line denotes a domain wall. A possible state after one A-B annihilation step could be

$$\overset{A}{1}|2\ 2\ \overset{B}{2}|1|2|3|2|1... \tag{21}$$

The A-B annihilation dynamics in eqns. (13) - (refeq:rule3) thus maps a dynamics to the following dynamics for domain walls:

$$q_1|q_2|q_1 \xrightarrow{1} q_1\ q_1\ q_1 \text{ and} \tag{22}$$

$$q_1\ q_1|q_2 \overset{1/2}{\rightleftharpoons} q_1|q_2\ q_2 \tag{23}$$

This is different from the traditional Glauber dynamics for the q-state Potts model [22], in which domain walls can coalesce as well (a process of the kind $q_1|q_2|q_3 \to q_2\ q_2|q_3$). In our mapping domain walls cannot coalesce, as this does not correspond to any of the A-B reactions. The non-coalescence condition models the exclusion between particles of the same species.

A domain with a given value of $q = i$, say, is called an i-domain. Starting from the i.c. eqn. (20), none of the 2-domains can be annihilated at the first time-step due to exclusion. A 2-domain can be annihilated only if it has 1-domains on both sides, or 3-domains on both sides. Thinking back to the kinetic symmetry-broken Ising model, we can thus assign a local value of $\alpha = 0$ to a 2-domain lying between a 1- and a 3-domain, and $\alpha = 1$ to ones with same domains on either side. It is also easy to see that 1-domains and 3-domains will always be surrounded by 2-domains on both sides, and hence have $\alpha = 1$.

Now we can map the evolution of domains walls in this system to that of a corresponding Ising configuration with kinetic symmetry breaking, by labeling 1- and 3-domains as '+' domains and 2-domains as '−' domains, now allowed to have a local values of α. The value of α for the 2-domains changes on merging according to the rule $\alpha^{new} = (\alpha^1 + \alpha^2) \mod (2)$. At $t = 0$, $\overline{\alpha_2} = 0$.

The results for the kinetic-symmetry-broken Ising model depend only on the fact that $\overline{\alpha}$ approaches a constant value < 1 at large times. We now argue that the value of $\overline{\alpha}$, which starts at 0, converges at long times to 1/2, never becoming 1. At large times, the system is dominated by large 2-domains, punctuated by small 1- and 3-domains which rarely merge. The long-time value of $\overline{\alpha}$ is given by the steady-state value of α of the merging process $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \to (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) \mod (2)$. In this steady-state, $\alpha = 0$ and $\alpha = 1$ are equally likely, giving $\overline{\alpha}_{t\to\infty} = 1/2$.

Since this $\overline{\alpha} < 1$, the results from the previous sections carry over, and we expect that

$$N(t) \approx \frac{c}{\sqrt{t}\log(bt)} \tag{24}$$

Now consider the i.c. with $n = 3$. Mapping it to a 4-state model, we get

$$\overset{A\ A\ A\ B\ B\ B\ A\ A\ A\ B\ B\ B}{1\,|\,2\,|\,3\,|\,4\,|\,3\,|\,2\,|\,1\,|\,2\,|\,3\,|\,4\,|\,3\,|\,2\,|\,1\ldots} \tag{25}$$

The evolution rules are as in eqns. (22) and (23), with annihilation but no coalescence of domain walls.

Again we attempt a mapping to the process studied in the previous section, making use of a symmetry in the IIA dynamical equations when starting from this i.c. There is a symmetry between the evolution of domains with $q = i$ and $q = 5 - i$, that is, q-values which are at the same 'depth' inside A- or B-blocks in the eqn (25). The 1- and 4- domains can always be annihilated if they reach unit length, giving $\overline{\alpha}_1 = \overline{\alpha}_4 = 1$ whereas for the 2- and 3- domains $\overline{\alpha}_2 = \overline{\alpha}_3 = \overline{\alpha} < 1$ as $t \to \infty$.

Forgetting for the moment the distinction between 2- and 3- domains, we assign them both the label '−', and assign 1- and 4-domains the label '+'. After this labeling the i.c. becomes

$$+\,|\,-\,-|\,+\,|\,-\,-|\,+\,|\,-\,-|\,+\,|\ldots \tag{26}$$

where only domain walls of types 1|2, 2|1, 3|4, and 4|3 are visible. Call $N_2(t)$ the density of domain walls of the types 2|3 and 3|2, which are within the '−' domains above. Call $N_1(t)$ the density of these domain walls. Then, for large times, $N_1(t)$ is bounded from above by the kinetic-symmetry-broken Glauber decay

$$N_1(t) \le O(t^{-1/2}(\log(t))^{-1}) \tag{27}$$

The 2- and 3- domains coarsen within the large '−' domains in the labeling above. The average size of a '−' domain grows with time as $t^{1/2}\log(t)$. The 2- and 3-domains have the same value of α, and thus there is no kinetic symmetry-breaking between them, and the average sizes of 2- and 3-domains thus grow diffusively, as $t^{1/2}$. (This is the Leyvraz and Redner picture mentioned in the introduction.) Hence, $N_2(t) \approx c/\sqrt{t}$. (Each '−'-domain, coarsening according to the kinetic-symmetry-broken picture, of size $\sqrt{t}\log(t)$, contains $\sim \log(t)$ domain walls between 2- and 3-domains.) Hence

$$N(t) = N_1(t) + N_2(t) \sim t^{-1/2}(1 + O((\log(t))^{-1})) \tag{28}$$

Generalization to longer blocks: We now proceed to longer blocks ($n > 3$), for whom there seems to be no simple relabeling scheme which allows one to use results from the Kinetic symmetry-broken Ising model. However, we will use the insights of the preceding section to determine the form of the final uniform state, more precisely, whether it is always a particular q-value or if it is two q-values with equal probability, and then construct an approximate mapping, valid as $t \to \infty$, which allows one to determine the dominant term in the long-time decay.

Let us consider the $n = 4$ i.c. Mapping the domain walls $q|(q+1) \to A$ and $q|(q-1) \to B$ as before, the initial condition with $n = 4$ becomes

$$\overset{A\ A\ A\ A\ B\ B\ B\ B\ A\ A\ A\ A\ B\ B\ B\ B}{1\,|\,2\,|\,3\,|\,4\,|\,5\,|\,4\,|\,3\,|\,2\,|\,1\,|\,2\,|\,3\,|\,4\,|\,5\,|\,4\,|\,3\,|\,2\,|\,1\ldots} \tag{29}$$

We first note a couple of things from eqn. (29): (a) There is a symmetry between the evolution for q and $(6-q)$-type domains, and (b) the 1- and 5- type domains will get annihilated quickly, the average distance between them growing at least as fast as $t^{1/2}\log(t)$.

We proceed to the determination of the asymptotic behaviour of $N(t)$ by showing these three things:

(1) The final state is almost always the uniform state with $q = 3$,

(2) $\overline{\alpha}_3 \to 1/2$ as $t \to \infty$, and

(3) The number of 2- and 4-domains is of the same order as the number of 5- and 1-domains, upper bounded by $c/(\sqrt{t}\log(bt))$.

Let us start with (1). We argue by contradiction. The final state cannot be $q = 1$ and $q = 5$, and if it is $q = 4$, by symmetry, it should be $q = 2$ with an equal probability, and hence the system at large times should be in a state with coarsening 4-type and 2-type domains of typical size $\sim t^{1/2}$ (this is the Leyvraz and Redner picture again). However, 4-type and 2-type domains cannot be in contact due to the un-eliminable 3-domains between them. However, the 2- and 4-domains *can* be eliminated by these 3-domains surrounding them on both sides, and hence the proposed late-time configurations are unstable to takeover by the 3-domains. Hence the

final state is a uniform $q = 3$ state with probability 1 in the thermodynamic limit.

The late-time state looks (schematically) like this:

$$33\ldots33\overset{B}{|}222\overset{A}{|}33\ldots33\overset{A}{|}4444\overset{B}{|}55|44\ldots44\overset{B}{|}33\ldots \quad (30)$$

There are large 3-type domains, tiny and rare 1- and 5-domains, and 2- and 4-domains of a characteristic size as yet undetermined. The density of 1- and 5-type domains, call it $n_1(t)$, decays at least as fast as $1/(t^{1/2}\log(t))$. Denote the density of 2- and 4-type domains as $n_2(t)$ and that of 3-type domains as $n_3(t)$.

To show (2), namely that the value of $\overline{\alpha}_3$ approaches $1/2$ for large times, we can apply the same reasoning as in section III, namely that it is given by the steady-state value of the process $(\alpha_1^{old} + \alpha_2^{old}) \mod (2) \to \alpha^{new}$.

We proceed to (3). We have two types of 2-domains: those with $\alpha = 0$ have a 3-domain on one side and a 1-domain on the other, while those with $\alpha = 1$ have 3-domains on both sides. (We can neglect the number of 2-domains with 1-domains on both sides.) The same goes for 4-domains, with the result that $\overline{\alpha}_2 = \overline{\alpha}_4 < 1$.

The system can now be considered to be made of only 2-, 3- and 4-domains. The 1- and 5-domains can now be neglected, as their presence is captured by assigning $\alpha = 0$ to the 2- and 4-domains adjacent to them. We have thus reduced our $q = 5$ system to the one studied in the previous section, with $q = 3$. We know for sure that $\overline{\alpha}_2 \geq \overline{\alpha}_3$. We consider two cases:

(1) $\overline{\alpha}_2 > 1/2$ in the long time limit. Then we are allowed to apply the results of the the $q = 3$ case, and thus $n_2(t) = O((\log(t))^{-1})$.

(2) In the long time limit, $\overline{\alpha}_2 = \overline{\alpha}_3 = 1/2$. Recall that the value of $\overline{\alpha}_+$ depends on the fraction of 2-domains which are the neighbours of 1-domains. That is, $\overline{\alpha}_2 = 1 - n_1(t)/n_2(t)$. Thus, for all $\overline{\alpha}_2 < 1$, and in particular for $\overline{\alpha}_2 = 1/2$, we have

$$n_2(t) = O(n_1(t)) = \frac{c}{\sqrt{t}\log(bt)} \quad (31)$$

Hence, in both cases, the total number of domains walls, $N(t) = 4n_1(t) + 2n_2(t) = \frac{c'}{\sqrt{t}\log(b't)}$.

A similar procedure can be followed for $n > 4$ i.c.s, to derive that

(a) for even n, there is a definite final state in the thermodynamic limit, the one with $q = n/2 + 1$. As a result, at large enough times domains with this value of q have $\alpha = 1/2$, while the density of other types of domains $\sim t^{-1/2}(\log(t))^{-1}$. Hence $N(t) \sim \frac{C}{\sqrt{t}\log(Bt)}$.

(b) for odd n, there is a symmetry between q- and $n + 2 - q$-domains. Hence the final state can be the uniform states $q = \lfloor n/2+1 \rfloor$ or $q = \lceil n/2+1 \rceil$ with equal probability. Hence $N(t) \sim t^{-1/2}$ for large t.



FIG. 1. A plot of $1/(N(t)\sqrt{t})$ (arbitrary units) against $\log(t)$, which either asymptotes to a straight line with a positive slope (even n), or to a constant (odd n). A pure power law decay is plotted for comparison - note the upward curvature of the line, absent from the simulation results.



FIG. 2. A plot of $1/(N(t)\sqrt{t})$ (arbitrary units) against $\log(t)$, for initial conditions made of the units $(AB)^m(AABB)^n$, denoted by m:n. The results exhibit a crossover between intermediate-time $t^{-1/2}/\log(t)$ behaviour and eventual $t^{-1/2}$ behaviour, with crossover time depending on the ratio n/m.

First-passage Monte Carlo Simulations: We used a first-passage Monte Carlo algorithm [23] to run fast simulations of the decay starting from various initial conditions. Due to the dynamic nature of the algorithm, we could go to very large times, and use large lattice sizes. We used the lattice variant of the method, described in [24].

Figure 1 shows the results of these simulations, starting from initial conditions with block lengths $n = 1$ to $n = 5$ on systems with $L = 10^7$, and periodic boundary conditions. We plot $(N(t)\sqrt{(t)}^{-1}$ versus $\log(t)$, showing tat it either asymptotes to a constant, or to a straight line on the logarithmic scale. We also studied the long-time behaviour (data not shown) of $\overline{\alpha}$ for various q-domains for $n = 2, 3, 4$, and and the results are consistent with the discussion in the previous sections.

More general initial conditions: Define a 'motif' as a finite-length string made of A's, B's and empty sites such that the number of A's is equal to the number of B's, and at no point along the motif, going from left to right, does the number of B's exceed the number of A's. Examples of motifs are the elementary blocks we have considered so far, viz. 'AB', 'AABB', etc. In this section, we briefly consider first-passage MC simulations starting from an initial configuration which is periodic and composed of two motifs, in differing ratios.

The two motifs are 'AB' and 'AABB', and the notation m:n denotes an initial configuration made by the repetition of the block $(AB)^m(AABB)^n$ to fill the lattice. Fig 2 shows the long-time behaviour of the density of surviving particles as the ratio $r = m/n$ is changed from 0 to 1. It shows a crossover from the behaviour at $r = 0$, which is $N(t) \sim t^{-1/2}(\log(t))^{-1}$ to $N(t) \sim t^{-1/2}$, where the crossover time seems to grow larger for smaller r. Hence for small r, there is a long time regime where the decay behaves similar to the $AABB$ i.c., but it seems that for long times it would always cross over to a $t^{-1/2}$ behaviour, for sufficiently large lattices. The behaviour of more complicated periodic combinations of motifs, and indeed, of random combinations of motifs, is at present unknown. However, based on the above simulations, we expect the existence of two decay regimes even in these cases.

Odor and Meynhard [18] studied the decay for a system which can be mapped to two species annihilation, for initial conditions which can be mapped to a random mixtures of AABB and AB blocks, in our notation. As they varied the proportions of different types of blocks in the ic, they saw a change in the decay exponent, from about 0.53 to about 0.56. This is consistent with the crossover phenomenon we observed above, which especially for the relatively small system sizes studied ($L = 24000$) can behave like a changing exponent slightly different from 0.5. Lee's results [12] for the 'natural' initial conditions, which show an effective exponent different from and lying between the ones he observed for n even and n odd, can also be explained in this fashion.

Conclusions: We have shown, using the Independent Interval Approximation, and through a mapping to a q-state model, that the effect of exclusion in A-B annihilation in one dimension is to induce kinetic symmetry-breaking in the coarsening process. In particular, we studied initial conditions of the type $A^nB^nA^nB^n...$, showing, within the Independent Interval Approximation, that the number of surviving particles at large times decays as $t^{-1/2}$ for n odd, and as $t^{-1/2}(\log(t))^{-1}$ for n even. We also performed first-passage Monte Carlo simulations to verify our claims, and studied the behaviour in a system with a mixture of two types of blocks, showing two time regimes. These results also explain the results of Lee on the Conserved Lattice Gas in 1D, which maps to the A-B annihilation problem. These results are also important in light of recent controversies about the effect of initial conditions on critical relaxation in 1D absorbing phase transitions [25, 26], of which the CLG is the simplest solvable example.

One can also consider multi-species reactions in 1D [4] with periodic initial conditions and same-species exclusion. Perhaps the mapping to a q-state model can be extended to these cases.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Paul Krapivsky for pointing me to very useful references, Kabir Ramola and Francois Landes for helpful discussions and comments on the manuscript, and Deepak Dhar and Kedar Damle for useful discussions.

[1] Ya. B. Zeldovich and A. A. Ovchinnikov, Chem. Phys. **28**, 215 (1978)
[2] D. Toussaint and F. Wilzek, J. Chem. Phys. **78**, 2642 (1983)
[3] P. Argyrakis and R. Kopelmanm, Phys. Rev. A **41**, 2121 (1990)
[4] D. ben Avraham and S. Redner, Phys. Rev. A **34**, 501 (1986)
[5] K. Kang and S. Redner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 955 (1984)
K. Kang and S. Redner, Phys. Rev. A **32**, 435 (1985)
[6] F. Leyvraz and S. Redner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 2168 (1991)
F. Leyvraz and S. Redner, Phys. Rev. A **46**, 3132 (1992)
[7] M. Bramson and D. Griffeath, Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete **53**, 183 (1980)
D. C. Torney and H. M. McConnell, J. Phys. Chem. **87**, 1941 (1983)
[8] B. Derrida, Physics Reports **301**, 65 (1998)
B. Derrida, Pramana **64**, 695 (2005)
[9] T. E. Harris, J. Appl. Probab. **2**, 323 (1965)

[10] R. Arratia, Ann. Probab. **11**, 362 (1983)
[11] P. L. Krapivsky, K. Mallick, and T. Sadhu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 078101 (2014)
[12] S. B. Lee, J. Kor. Phys. Soc. **64**, 1636 (2014)
[13] M. Rossi, R. Pastor-Satorras, and A. Vespignani, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 1803 (2000)
[14] M. J. de Oliveira, Phys. Rev. E **71**, 016112 (2005)
[15] S. B. Lee and S.-G. Lee, Phys. Rev. E. **78**, 040103(R) (2008)
S.-G. Lee and S. B. Lee, Complex, Part I, LNICST **4**, 841 (2009)
[16] K. Jain, Phys. Rev. E **72**, 017105 (2005)
[17] S. Kwon and J. M. Kim, Phys. Rev. E **90**, 046101 (2014)
[18] G. Odor and N. Menyhard, Phys. Rev. E **61**, 6404 (2000)
[19] S. N. Majumdar, D. S. Dean and P. Grassberger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2301 (2001)
S. N. Majumdar and D. S. Dean, Phys. Rev. E **66**, 056114 (2002)
[20] P. L. Krapivsky and E. Ben-Naim, Phys. Rev. E **56**, 3788 (1997)
[21] S. Bondyopadhyay, Phys. Rev. E. **88**, 062125 (2013)
[22] B. Derrida, V. Hakim and V. Pasquier, J. Stat. Phys. **85**, 763 (1996)
[23] T. Oppelstrup, V. V. Bulatov, G. H. Gilmer, M. H. Kalos and B. Sadigh, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97** 230602 (2006)
[24] A. Bezzola, B.B. Bales, R.C. Alkire and L.R. Petzold, J. Comput. Phys. **256** 183 (2014)
[25] M. Basu, U. Basu, S. Bondyopadhyay, P. K. Mohanty, and H. Hinrichsen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 015702 (2012).
[26] S. Kwon and J. M. Kim, Phys. Rev. E **91**, 012149 (2015)